

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, and 41-44 are pending. Claims 7 and 15 have been cancelled, and Claims 1 and 9 have been amended. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 7 has been cancelled; therefore, the rejection of Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, is moot.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1, 2, 6, 8-10, 14, 16, 41-43, and 44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of U.S. Patent No. 1,762,111 to Wendell ("Wendell"), U.S. Patent No. 4,251,198 to Altenberg ("Altenberg") and U.S. Patent No. 5,947,805 to Van Osenbruggen ("Van Osenbruggen"). Insofar as they may be applied against the Claims, these rejections are overcome.

Rejected independent Claims 1 and 9 as now amended more particularly recite one of the distinguishing characteristics of the present invention, namely, "*irreversibly* bonding said piece of the second material to said cutting blade holder." (Emphasis added.) Support for this Amendment can be found on page 8, lines 14-16, among other places, of the original Application.

Neither Wendell, Altenberg, nor Van Osenbruggen teach, suggest, or disclose irreversibly bonding the cutting blades to the blade holder. Wendell discloses a cutting disc with adjustable

cutting heads. Altenburg discloses a cutter hub with replaceable blades, and Van Osenbruggen describes a rotary cutting disc for use in a hand-held angle grinder. Of all of the references, Van Osenbruggen discloses a permanently affixed tooth on a grinding blade. However, Van Osenbruggen does not disclose a precision application, as discussed in greater detail below.

The present inventions of Claims 1 and 9 are specifically designed to be employed in combination with an extruder die. Within these extrusion applications, very precise and repeatable cuts are necessary. In fact, it is highly desirable to have blades secured so tightly so as to render them immobile, so that the extruder will run to failure. In fact, if one attempts to remove the cutting blade from the holder after assembly, the cutter will be effectively unusable because of the high degree of difficulty in reassembling the cutters to the holder to perform the same function due mostly to warpage. Therefore, the purpose in providing a very precise cutting plane is served by irreversibly bonding the cutting blades to the blade holder. Thus, the present inventions of Claims 1 and 9 provide a benefit that neither Wendell, Altenberg, nor Van Osenbruggen provide, singularly or in combination. Indeed, being adjustable, Wendell and Altenberg teach away from the claimed invention, while Van Osenbruggen discloses a very different structure from that claimed. There simply is no motivation to combine these references to obtain Applicant's claimed invention.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of Claims 1 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Wendell, Altenberg, and Van Osenbruggen be withdrawn and that Claims 1 and 9 be allowed.

GOEA 01803PTUS
S/N 09/777,735

Claims 2, 6, 8, 41, and 43 depend on and further limit amended Claim 1. Hence, for at least the aforementioned reasons, these Claims would be deemed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 10, 14, 16, 42, and 44 depend on and further limit amended Claim 9. Hence, for at least the aforementioned reasons, these Claims would be deemed to be in condition for allowance.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 4 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of Wendell, Altenberg, Van Osenbruggen, and U.S. Patent No. 5,054,354 to Kubis ("Kubis"). Insofar as they may be applied against the Claims, these rejections are overcome.

Claim 4 depends on and further limits amended Claim 1. Hence, for at least the aforementioned reasons, these Claims would be deemed to be in condition for allowance.

Claim 12 depends on and further limits amended Claim 9. Hence, for at least the aforementioned reasons, these Claims would be deemed to be in condition for allowance.

GOEA 01803PTUS
S/N 09/777,735

Conclusion

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place this Application in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, and 41-44.

Applicant does not believe that any other fees are due; however, in the event that any fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any required fees due (other than issue fees), and to credit any overpayment made, in connection with the filing of this paper to Deposit Account 50-2180 of Storm LLP.

Should the Examiner require any further clarification to place this application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Storm LLP

Dated: Sept. 14, 2005
Storm LLP
901 Main Street
Suite 7100
Dallas, Texas 75202
Telephone: (214) 347-4710
Fax: (214) 347-4799

John J. Patti
John J. Patti
Reg. No. 57,191